



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/504,236  | 02/15/2000  | Swain W. Porter      | 0034646.P008        | 7611             |
| 25943   | 7590        | 06/10/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.<br>PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900<br>1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE<br>PORTLAND, OR 97204 |             |                      | BAUGH, APRIL L      |                  |
|   |             | ART UNIT             |                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             | 2141                 |                     | 13               |
| DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004   |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application N<br>09/504,236 | Applicant(s)<br>PORTER, SWAIN W. |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
|                              | Examiner<br>April L Baugh   | Art Unit<br>2141                 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### **Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-55 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-55 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date .  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_ .

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 9, 13-14, 22-24, 28-33, 35-36, 38, 41, and 45-50 therefore claims 1-7 and 9-55 are now pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed April 1, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach first and second email addresses simultaneously pre-provided by the email service provider, or first and second email addresses is provided by the email service provider in real time in response to a first and second request. Applicant also argues that the prior art does not teach emails are organized by the email service provider and the email service provider provides the email to the user computer and the emails are presented to the user on the computer. Examiner's position is the Hunt et al. teaches the above features of the claimed invention (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. teaches, '...providing a unique proxy address for the user in a registration application so that communications addressed to the user using the unique address are received by the...registration agent server and are forwarded to the user. More preferably, the communications are forwarded to the user in dependence on an email filtering policy...The present invention's registration processing system offers the option to give protected email addresses to sites when a user registers through the interface. The site does not receive the user's

real address, but is instead given a unique proxy address by the registration processing system (a different one for each site).’ It is the examiner’s position that the registration agent server serves the same purpose as the email service provider and thus filters (which is the same as organizing) the emails and then provides them to the user computer. The registration agent server also upon request to register with a website provides a different proxy address (protected email address) so that the user can register with the website.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,496,855 to Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al.

Referring to claim 1, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: a user computer, on behalf of a user, registering the user with a first web site; the user computer providing a first email address received from an email service provider for use to register the user with said first web site; the user computer, on behalf of the user, registering the user with a second website; and the user computer providing a second email address received from the email service provider, separate and distinct from the first email address, for use to register said user with said second web site (column 4, lines 11-22 and column 10, lines 7-16); wherein either the first and second email addresses were simultaneously pre-provided to the user computer by the email service provider, or each of the first and second email addresses is provided to the user computer by the email service provider in real time in response to a first and a second request (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 7, lines 12-19).

Hunt et al. does not teach email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider. Moon et al. teaches the email address provided to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by providing email address to the user computer by the email service provider post enrollment of the user as a service subscriber of the email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email through the provider.

Referring to claim 21, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19); the e-device selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and the e-device selecting a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a second CP/GCP (column 4, lines 11-20 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider. Moon et al. teaches an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et

al. by having the an electronic device (e-device) obtaining a plurality of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 24 Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving for a user, a first email address (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19); the e-device employing the received first email address to facilitate communication between the user and a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); the e-device requesting and receiving for the user, a second email address, separate and distinct from said first email address; and the e-device employing the received second email address to facilitate communication between the user and a second CP/GCP (column 4, lines 11-20 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider. Moon et al. teaches an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by having the an electronic device (e-device) requesting and receiving a first and second email address from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 28, Hunt et al. teaches a method comprising: providing at least a first and a second email address, that are separate and distinct, to the e-device for use by the e-device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP) (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach an email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address. Moon et al. teaches an email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by a email service provider registering a user as a service subscriber of the email service provider; and the email service provider providing at least an email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 39, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses, to selecting a first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with a first communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP), and to select a second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication

with a second CP/GCP; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider. Moon et al. teaches the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a plurality, of distinct email addresses from an email service provider because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 41, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) designed to enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address in real time, and correspondingly earmarking said first and second distinct email addresses to facilitate communication between a user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time. Moon et al. teaches enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time (column 1, lines 20-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to obtain a first and a second distinct email address from an email service provider in real time because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 45. Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) design to provide at least an email address, that are separate and distinct, to an electronic device of the user for use by the electronic device to facilitate communication between the user and a first and a second communication partner or group of communication partners (CP/GCP); and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16).

Hunt et al. does not teach enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address. Moon et al. teaches enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the

apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address (column 1, lines 20-28).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration system of Hunt et al. by enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to register a user as a service subscriber of the apparatus, and to provide at least a first and a second email address because the email service provider's (email server) function is to produce an email address (mailbox) for the subscribed computer so that a user may send and receive email.

Regarding claim 3, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 5, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of distinct email addresses provided by said email service provider to said user computer (column 4, lines 11-16 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 6, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein the method further comprises the user computer pre-obtaining the distinct email addresses from the email service provider (column 4, lines 11-18 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 9, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each of said providing of the first and second email addresses by the user computer comprises the user computer dynamically obtaining said first/second email address from the email service provider s

the user computer registers the user with the first/second web site (column 4, lines 11-18 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 12, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the method further comprises the user computer notifying the email service provider of the usage of the first and second email address, including addresses of the first and the second web site (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 13, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein each of said notification is performed integrally as said first/second email address is provided to said user for use to register the user with the first/second web site (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 14, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 12, wherein said notifications are performed subsequently in batch after said first and second email addresses were provided to said user for use to register the user with the first and the second web site (column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 20, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the web site is a selected one of a content provider, a service provider and an access provider (column 1, lines 58-61 and column 5, lines 2-4 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 22, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the first of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selection of the second of said distinct email

addresses to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 23, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 21, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said selections of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 25, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 24, wherein the method further comprises the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the first email address to facilitate communication with the first CP/GCP; and the e-device notifying the email service provider of said employment of the second email address to facilitate communication with the second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding to claim 26, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made integrally when the e-device requests for said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 27, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 25, wherein each of said notifications is made after the e-device having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 29, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 30, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method comprises the email service provider providing in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 31, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 32, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 28, wherein the method further comprises the email service provider receiving notification of usage of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 40, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 39, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) further enable the apparatus (when the programming instructions are executed) to notify the email service provider of said selection of the first and the second of said distinct email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and the second CP/GCP (column 1, lines 46-48 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 42, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 41, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to notify of said employment of the first and second email addresses to facilitate communication with the first and second CP/GCP (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 43, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said

Art Unit: 2141

notifications integrally when requesting for said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 44, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 42, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to make each of said notifications after having been provided with said first/second email address from said email service provider (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 46, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.) (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide a plurality of distinct email addresses to an electronic device (e-device) used by the user for the e-device to select said first and second separate and distinct email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 47, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to provide in real time said first/second email address to an electronic device used by the user (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Referring to claim 48, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) further enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage of said first/second email address with said first/second CP/GCP from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

Regarding claim 49, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 45, wherein the programming instructions (when executed) enable the apparatus to receive notification of usage

of said first and second email addresses with said first and second CP/GCP respectively from an electronic device used by the user (column 7, lines 12-19 of Hunt et al.).

2. Claims 2, 4, 7, 10, and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Hunt et al. and Moon et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Linden et al.

Regarding claim 2, Hunt et al. and Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 4, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the first email address comprises an address of the email service provider, and the second email address comprises the address of the same email service provider (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach of identifiers contained in the email address. Linden et al. teaches the first email address comprises a first user identifier, and the

second email address comprises a second user identifier, separate and distinct from said first user identifier (column 8, lines 62-63 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by having identifiers contained in the email address because this distinguishes one user who subscribes to the website from another user that subscribes to the same website.

Referring to claim 7, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 6 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach of pre-generation of email addresses. Linden et al. teaches the method further comprises the email service provider pre-generating the distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by pre-generating email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Referring to claim 10, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. the method of claim 9, wherein each of said dynamically obtaining comprises the email service provider selecting said first/second email address (column 2, line 66 through column 3, line 9 and column 4, lines 11-20 and column 5, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 12-19 and column 10, lines 7-16 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach pre-generation of distinct email addresses. Linden et al. teaches selecting said first/second email address from a plurality of pre-generated distinct email addresses (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by pre-generating distinct email addresses because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

Regarding claim 11, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 9 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address. Linden et al. teaches the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address (column 6, lines 46-47 of Linden et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of and Moon et al. by having the email service provider dynamically generating said first/second email address because this eliminates the need for the user to create an email address and this also avoids redundancy in email addresses.

3. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 12-14, 20-27, 28-32, 39-41, and 43-49 above, and further in view of Kamiya et al.

Referring to claim 15, Hunt et al. . in view of and Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 1 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches receiving emails addressed to said first and second email addresses; organizing said

Art Unit: 2141

received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on whether the emails are addressed to the first or the second email address because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

4. Claims 16-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. and Kamiya et al. as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Flemming, III.

Regarding claim 16, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. and Kamiya teaches the method of claim 15 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. and Kamiya does not teach organizing of said received emails. Flemming, III teaches organizing of said received emails is at least further based on whether said received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses were sent by said first/second web site or not (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. and Kamiya by organizing of said received emails because this notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 17, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 16 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to said first/second email addresses not sent by said first/second web site, while preserving all undeleted emails addressed to said first/second email addresses sent by said first/second web site (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by deleting all received emails not sent by said first/second web site because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 18, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 17 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user. Kamiya et al. teaches said bifurcated deletion is performed in response to an instruction of said user (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by having the deletion performed in response to an instruction of said user because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 19, Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. teaches the method of claim 18 (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. does not teach providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Moon et al. by providing said deletion instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

1. Claims 33-38, 50-55 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,266,690 to Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. and further in view of Fleming, III.

Regarding claim 33, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended

communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches a email service provider receiving emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user; and the email service provider organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses, and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 34, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by emails characterized by at least said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and

second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user, with the emails characterized by at least said and intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 35, Hunt et al. teaches of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by emails are characterized based at least in part on by email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails are characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Flemming, III teaches receiving emails, from an email service provider, wherein the emails are characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of

each of said email addresses; and presenting said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said email addresses and said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by having the emails characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 36, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 35 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address. Kamiya et al. teaches deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partner of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 37, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 36 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach deletion is performed in response to user instruction. Kamiya et al. teaches deletion is performed in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by having deletion performed in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 38, Hunt et al. teaches the method of claim 37 of email addresses (column 4, lines 11-20 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

Regarding claim 50, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches receive emails addressed to a first and a second email address of a user, and to organize said received emails based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by organizing said received emails based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 51, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 50, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by organize said received emails based at least in part on said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses. Flemming, III teaches provide said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.) Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by providing said emails to the user, with emails characterized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said first and second email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Regarding claim 52, Hunt et al. teaches an apparatus comprising: a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses. Kamiya et al. teaches emails being characterized based at least in part on by email

Art Unit: 2141

addresses (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on by email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from.

Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. does not teach emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses. Flemming, III. teaches receiving emails from an email service provider, the emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses, and to present said emails for viewing by a user, organized by at least said intended versus unintended communication partners of said email addresses; and a processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the plurality of programming instructions (column 3, lines 47-51 and 54-56 of Flemming, III.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. in view of Kamiya et al. by emails being characterized based at least in part on intended versus unintended communication partners of each of said email addresses because this helps the user discern from which website the emails are from and notifies the user of whether the emails are from a website the user subscribed to.

Referring to claim 53, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 52, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address.

Kamiya et al. teaches delete all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address (column 4, lines 3-10 and column 9, lines 38-51 and column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by deleting all received emails addressed to the first/second email address not sent by the intended communication partners of the first/second email address because these emails are of no interest to the user since they did not subscribe to those sites therefore this frees up memory in the system.

Regarding claim 54, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach perform said deletion in response to user instruction. Kamiya et al. teaches perform said deletion in response to user instruction (column 17, lines 24-30 of Kamiya et al.). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by performing said deletion in response to user instruction because this allows the user to read emails that may not come from registered websites.

Referring to claim 55, Hunt et al. teaches the apparatus of claim 54, wherein the programming instructions (column 11, lines 57-60 of Hunt et al.).

Hunt et al. does not teach provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button. Kamiya et al. teaches provide the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button (column 17, lines 24-30 and column 23, lines 23-28 of Kamiya et al.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the web site registration proxy system of Hunt et al. by providing the user with an end user interface feature to provide said user instruction with a single press of a key/control button because this is an efficient way of allowing the user to quickly delete any unwanted emails.

*Conclusion*

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to online information transaction systems in general: Gabber et al., Megiddo, and Will.

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L Baugh whose telephone number is 703-305-5317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal D Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB



RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER